



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/599,505	12/13/2006	Yoshinori Sekiguchi	Q80753	1001		
23373	7590	10/01/2009	EXAMINER			
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037				BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN		
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER				
1624						
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE				
10/01/2009		PAPER				

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/599,505	SEKIGUCHI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	/Venkataraman Balasubramanian/	1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09/29/2006, 03/25/2008</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-45 are pending.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

References cited in the Information Disclosure Statements, filed on 9/29/2006 & 3/25/2008, are made of record.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

1. Claims 24-28 provide for the use of compound of claim 1, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for making pharmaceutically acceptable salts does not reasonably provide enablement for making hydrate or solvate. The specification

Art Unit: 1624

does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered.

Note In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and Ex parte Forman, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

1. The nature of the invention and the state of the prior art:

The invention is drawn to compound of formula I, or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt hydrate or solvate thereof. Specification is not adequately enabled as to how to make hydrate or solvate of compounds of formula (I) Specification has no example of hydrate of the instant compounds. Specification (on page 37, line 9, page 47, line 27) recites solvate or hydrate thereof but there is no enabling of such compounds.

The compound of formula I embrace isomeric pyrimidine compounds substituted with variable groups, L, Y, R<sub>1</sub>, Z<sub>1</sub>, Z<sub>2</sub>, Z<sub>3</sub>, Z<sub>4</sub> and R<sub>2</sub>.

Even a cursory calculation of the number of compounds embraced in the instant formula (I) based on the generic definition of alkyl., aryl heteroaryl, heterocyclyl, substituted aryl, heteroaryl, arylalkyloxy, arylalkylthio etc would result in millions of compounds. This is of course not the accurate number and the true number of compounds would far exceed this number of compounds. Thus the genus embraced in

the claim 1 is too large and there is no teaching of any solvate or hydrate of this large genus.

Search in the pertinent art, including water as solvent resulted in a pertinent reference, which is indicative of unpredictability of hydrate formation in general. The state of the art is that is not predictable whether solvates or hydrates will form or what their composition will be. In the language of the physical chemist, a hydrate of organic molecule is an interstitial solid solution. This phrase is defined in the second paragraph on page 358 of West (Solid State Chemistry). The solvent molecule is a species introduced into the crystal and no part of the organic host molecule is left out or replaced. In the first paragraph on page 365, West (Solid State Chemistry) says, "it is not usually possible to predict whether solid solutions will form, or if they do form what is the compositional extent". Thus, in the absence of experimentation one cannot predict if a particular solvent will solvate any particular crystal. One cannot predict the stoichiometry of the formed solvate, i.e. if one, two, or a half a molecule of solvent added per molecule of host. Compared with polymorphs, there is an additional degree of freedom to hydrates, which means a different solvent or even the moisture of the air that might change the stable region of the hydrate. In the instant case of hydrate a similar reasoning therefore apply. Water is a solvent and hence it is held that a pertinent detail of West, which relates to solvates, is also applicable to hydrate

In addition, an additional search resulted in Vippagunta et al., Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews 48: 3-26, 2001, which clearly states that formation of hydrates is unpredictable. See entire document especially page 18, right column section 3.4. Note

Art Unit: 1624

Vippagunta et al., states "Each solid compound responds uniquely to the possible formation of solvates or hydrates and hence generalizations cannot be made for series of related compounds".

2. The predictability or lack thereof in the art:

Hence, the hydrate and solvate as applied to the above-mentioned compounds claimed by the applicant are not art-recognized compounds and hence there should be adequate enabling disclosure in the specification with working example(s).

3. The amount of direction or guidance present:

Examples illustrated in the experimental section are limited to making the compounds not related to solvates and hydrates. There is no example of a solvate or hydrate of instant compound. Over 522 compounds were shown in the examples of the specification each of which has come in contact with water and other solvent but there is no showing that instant compounds formed solvates or hydrates. Hence it is clear that merely bring the compound with solvent or water does not result in solvate or hydrate and additional direction or guidance is needed to make them Specication has no such direction or guidance.

4. The presence or absence of working examples:

There is no working example of any solvate or hydrate formed. The claims are drawn to hydrate, yet the numerous examples presented all failed to produce a solvate or hydrate or even hydrate. These cannot be simply willed into existence. As was stated in Morton International Inc. v. Cardinal Chemical Co., 28 USPQ2d 1190 "The specification purports to teach, with over fifty examples, the preparation of the claimed

compounds with the required connectivity. However ... there, is no evidence that such compounds exist... the examples of the '881 patent do not produce the postulated compounds... there is ...‘ no evidence that such compounds even exist.’ The same circumstance appears to be true here. There is no evidence that hydrates of these compounds actually exists; if they did, they would have formed. Hence, there should be showing supporting that solvates and hydrates of these compounds exist and therefore can be made.

5. The breadth of the claims & the quantity of experimentation needed:

Speciation has no support, as noted above, for compounds generically embraced in the claims 1-45 would lead to desired solvate and hydrate of the compound of formula I. As noted above, the genus embraces over million compounds and hence the breadth of the claim is broad. The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden on skilled art in the chemical art since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan for the many reasons stated above. Even with the undue burden of experimentation, there is no guarantee that one would get the product of desired hydrate of compound of formula I embraced in the instant claims in view of the pertinent reference teachings.

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, “A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993).” That conclusion is

Art Unit: 1624

clearly justified here. Thus, undue experimentation will be required to make Applicants' invention.

Claims 21-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for obesity and diabetes does not reasonably provide enablement for prophylaxis of diabetes and obesity as well as prophylaxis or treatment of improving memory function, sleeping and arousal, anxiety, depression, mood disorders, seizure, appetite and eating disorders, cardiovascular disease, hypertension, dyslipidemia, myocardial infarction, binge eating disorders including bulimia, anorexia, mental disorders including manic depression, schizophrenia, delirium, dementia, stress, cognitive disorders, attention deficit disorder, substance abuse disorders and dyskinesias including Parkinson's disease, epilepsy, and addiction embraced in these claims. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and Ex parte Forman, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) level of skill in the art, 8) the quantity of experimentation needed.

1) The nature of the invention:

Art Unit: 1624

The instant method of use claims 21-44 are drawn to besides treating obesity and diabetes, prophylaxis of obesity and diabetes as well as prophylaxis and treating various diseases such as prophylaxis or treatment of improving memory function, sleeping and arousal, anxiety, depression, mood disorders, seizure, obesity, diabetes, appetite and eating disorders, cardiovascular disease, hypertension, dyslipidemia, myocardial infarction, binge eating disorders including bulimia, anorexia, mental disorders including manic depression, schizophrenia, delirium, dementia, stress, cognitive disorders, attention deficit disorder, substance abuse disorders and dyskinesias including Parkinson's disease, epilepsy, and addiction, by inhibiting melanin concentrating hormone receptor(MCH) in general.

Instant claims, as recited, are reach through claims. A reach through claim is a claim drawn to a mechanistic, receptor binding or enzymatic functionality in general format and thereby reach through a scope of invention for which they lack adequate written description and enabling disclosure in the specification.

In the instant case, based on the inhibition of MCH receptor instant claims reach through inhibiting and treating various disease stated above in general and thereby they lack adequate written description and enabling disclosure in the specification.

The scope of the claims includes millions of compounds of claim 1 as well as the thousand of diseases embraced by the terms various diseases stated above. Thus, the scope of claims is extremely broad.

More specifically, in the instant case, based on the mode of action of instant compounds as inhibitor of MCH receptor, based on limited assay, it is claimed that treating various

Art Unit: 1624

disorders and diseases including prophylaxis or treatment of improving memory function, sleeping and arousal, anxiety, depression, mood disorders, seizure, obesity, diabetes, appetite and eating disorders, cardiovascular disease, hypertension, dyslipidemia, myocardial infarction, binge eating disorders including bulimia, anorexia, mental disorders including manic depression, schizophrenia, delirium, dementia, stress, cognitive disorders, attention deficit disorder, substance abuse disorders and dyskinesias including Parkinson's disease, epilepsy, and addiction in general, for which there is no enabling disclosure. which is not adequately enabled solely based on the activity of the compounds provided in the specification.

The instant compounds are disclosed to have MCH receptor inhibitory activity and it is recited that the instant compounds are therefore useful in treating any or all diseases stated above for which applicants provide no competent evidence. It appears that the applicants are asserting that the embraced compounds because of their mode action as cell proliferation inhibitor that would be useful for all sorts of disorders and diseases. However, the applicants have not provided any competent evidence that the instantly disclosed tests are highly predictive for all the uses disclosed and embraced by the claim language for the intended host.

In addition the scope of these claims includes prophylaxis. The term "prophylaxis" actually means to prevent spread of a disease (as per Meriam Webster's Dictionary). "To prevent" actually means to anticipate or counter in advance, to keep from happening etc. (as per Websters II Dictionary) and therefore it is not understood how one skilled in the art can reasonably establish the basis and the type of subject to

which the instant compounds can be administered in order to have the "prevention" effect. It is inconceivable from this in vitro data, as to how the claimed compounds can not only treat but also "prevent" a myriad of diseases associated with the stated activity. Further, there is no evidence on record which demonstrates that the in-vitro and ex vivo screening test relied upon is recognized in the art as being reasonably predictive of success in any of the contemplated areas of 'prevention'. Such a reasonable correlation is necessary to demonstrate such utilities. See Ex parte Stevens, 16 USPQ 2d 1379 (BPAI 1990); Ex parte Busse et al., 1 USPQ 2d 1908 (BPAI 1986) (the evidence must be accepted as "showing" such utility, and not "warranting further study"). Furthermore, there is no evidence of record, which would enable the skilled artisan in the identification of the people who have the potential of becoming afflicted with the disorders encompassed by the instant claims. Under such circumstances, it is proper for the PTO to require evidence that such an unprecedented feat has actually been accomplished, In re Ferens, 163 USPQ 609. No such evidence has been presented in this case. The failure of skilled scientists to achieve a goal is substantial evidence that achieving such a goal is beyond the skill of practitioners in that art, Genentech vs. Novo Nordisk, 42 USPQZM 1001, 1006.

No compound has ever been found to treat disorders of all types generally. Since this assertion is contrary to what is known in medicine, proof must be provided that this revolutionary assertion has merits. The existence of such a "compound" is contrary to our present understanding of modern medicine. Also see the PTO website <<[>>](http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/1pecba.htm#7)

ENABLEMENT DECISION TREE, Example F, situation 1) which is directed to the scope of cancer.

Also, note MPEP 2164.08(b) which states that claims that read on "... significant numbers of inoperative embodiments would render claims nonenabled when the specification does not clearly identify the operative embodiments and undue experimentation is involved in determining those that are operative.". Clearly that is the case here.

Thus, it is beyond the skill of clinician today to get an agent to be effective against all disorders stated generally. Note substantiation of utility and its scope is required when utility is "speculative", "sufficiently unusual" or not provided. See Ex parte Jovanovics, 211 USPQ 907, 909; In re Langer 183 USPQ 288. Also note Hoffman v. Klaus 9 USPQ 2d 1657 and Ex parte Powers 220 USPQ 925 regarding type of testing needed to support in vivo uses.

Next, applicant's attention is drawn to the Revised Utility and Written Description Guidelines, at 66 FR 1092-1099, 2001 wherein it is emphasized that 'a claimed invention must have a specific and substantial utility'. The disclosure in the instant case is not sufficient to enable the instantly claimed method treating solely based on the inhibitory activity disclosed for the compounds.

2) The state of the prior art: The state of the art is indicative of the requirement for undue experimentation. See Mendez-Andino et al., Drug Discovery Today, Vol. 12(21/22), 972-979, 2007. See also Kowalski et al. Expert Opin. Investig. Drugs 13(9), 1113-1122, 2004 and Nahon, C. R. Biologies, 329, 623-638, 2006. Therefore, there

Art Unit: 1624

may be various possible adverse effects when a compound of formula (I) is given to a patient to treat any of the aforementioned diseases. Much experimentation and in vivo testing must be carried out to make sure that the administration of the compounds of formula (I) results in enhanced therapeutic effects without harmful side effects.

Hence, in the absence of showing of correlation between all the diseases claimed as capable of treatment with inhibition of altered protein kinase activity, one of skill in the art is unable to fully predict possible results from the administration of the compounds of formula (I) due to the unpredictability of the role of the instantly claimed compounds. Applicant's disclosure does not enable one of ordinary skill in the art to use the claimed invention within the entire scope of the diseases listed above. There is no compound, let alone an entire class of compounds that can treat the various and divergent diseases listed above, as claimed.

Those of skill in the art recognize that in vitro assays and or cell-cultured based assays are generally useful to observe basic physiological and cellular phenomenon such as screening the effects of potential drugs. However, clinical correlations are generally lacking. The greatly increased complexity of the in vivo environment as compared to the very narrowly defined and controlled conditions of an in- vitro assay does not permit a single extrapolation of in vitro assays to human diagnostic efficacy with any reasonable degree of predictability. In vitro assays cannot easily assess cell-cell interactions that may be important in a particular pathological state. 3) The predictability or lack thereof in the art: Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical use for treating any or all condition of the

instant compounds. Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, "the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved". See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

4) The amount of direction or guidance present:

A disclosure should contain representative examples which provide reasonable assurance to one skilled in the art that the compounds which fall within the scope of a claim will possess the alleged activity. The only direction or guidance present in the specification is the listing of diseases applicant considers treatable. Receptor activity is generally unpredictable and a highly structure specific area, and the data provided is insufficient for one of ordinary skill in the art to extrapolate to the other compounds of the claims.

The disclosure does not provide how this in vitro data correlates to the treatment of the assorted diseases claimed. The instant specification is short of any examples or data in regards to the supposed treating of the aforementioned diseases. Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical use of the instant compounds. Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, "the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved." See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

Art Unit: 1624

5) the presence or absence of working examples: Specification has no working examples to show treating any or all disorders stated above and the state of the art as noted above is that the effects of MCH receptor antagonists are unpredictable.

6) The breadth of the claims: The instant claims embrace use of a huge genus of compounds and any or all disorders.

7)The level of skill in the art

The level of skill in the art is high. However, due to the unpredictability in the pharmaceutical art, it is noted that each embodiment of the invention is required to be individually assessed for physiological activity by in vitro and in vivo screening to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activity and which diseases would benefit from this activity.

Thus, the specification fails to provide sufficient support of the broad use of the compounds of the instant claims for the treatment of the various claimed diseases as a result necessitating one of skill to perform an exhaustive search for which disorders can be treated by what compounds of the instant claims in order to practice the claimed invention.

8) The quantity of experimentation: The quantity of experimentation needed is undue experimentation. It would be an undue burden to one skilled in the pharmaceutical arts since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan, regarding the pharmaceutical use, for the reasons stated above. One of skill in the art would need to determine what diseases out of the multitude claimed would be benefited (i.e. treated)

by the administration of the compounds of formula (I) and would furthermore have to determine which of the claimed compounds would provide treatment of which disease.

Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", "the level of skill in the art" and "predictability", etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the instant case for the instant method claims. In view of the breadth of the claims, the chemical nature of the invention, the unpredictability of enzyme-inhibitor interactions in general, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds towards treating the variety of diseases of the instant claims, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the instantly claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

Genentech Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S (CA FC) 42 USPQ2d 1001, states that "a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for search, but compensation for its successful conclusion" and "[p]atent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable".

Therefore, in view of the Wands factors and In re Fisher (CCPA 1970) discussed above, to practice the claimed invention herein, a person of skill in the art would have to engage in undue experimentation to test which diseases can be treated by the compounds encompassed in the instant claims, with no assurance of success.

MPEP §2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was 'filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make

and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here and undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-6, 9-15, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schaper et al US. 5,691,321.

Schaper teaches several heterocyclic compounds of formula I, which include instant compounds. See column 1, formula I and note the definition of A, X, E, Y, Z, W and R<sup>1</sup>-R<sup>4</sup>. Note when A is N, compounds taught by Schaper include instant compounds. See column 1-19 for details of the invention, preferred embodiments and process of making. See column 27 through 49 including Tables 1-6 for examples of 584 compounds made which include instant compounds. Especially see examples 1-206 and various compounds of Table 2-6 wherein X is NH.

Claims 1-6, 9-15, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Obata et al WO 96/06086.

Obata teaches several pyrimidine compounds of formula I, which include instant compounds. See entire document. Especially see pages 51-66 which include instant compounds.

Claims 1-6, 9-15, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee et al WO 99/31072.

Lee teaches several pyrimidine compounds of formula I wherein G is G-1, which include instant compounds. See page 2, formula I and note the definition of G, X, Y and R<sup>1</sup>-R<sup>4</sup>. Note when G choice is G-1, compounds taught by Lee include instant compounds. See pages 2-19 for detailed description of the invention, various preferred embodiments and the process of making these pyrimidines. Especially see pages 19-85

including Tables 1-26 for large number of pyrimidines compounds which include those claimed in the instant claims.

Claims 1-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sekiguchi et al. EP 1,464,335.

The applied reference has a common inventors with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Sekiguchi teaches several pyrimidine derivatives of formula I as MCH antagonists which include instant compounds for the same use. See page 5, formula I and note the definition of Q, L, Y and R<sub>1</sub>. Note when R<sub>1</sub> is formula IV, compounds taught by Sekiguchi include instant compounds. See pages 5-133 for detailed description of the invention, various preferred embodiments, species made and pages 155-161 for the process of making these pyrimidines. Especially see species shown in pages 90-92, 99-103, 105-107,111, 117-132 for pyrimidine species. See also examples 1-3398 which include pyrimidines claimed in the instant claims.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 9-15, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Schaper et al US. 5,691,321.

Schaper teaches several heterocyclic compounds of formula I, which include instant compounds. See column 1, formula I and note the definition of A, X, E, Y, Z, W and R<sup>1</sup>-R<sup>4</sup>. Note when A is N, compounds taught by Schaper include instant compounds. See column 1-19 for details of the invention, preferred embodiments and process of making. See column 27 through 49 including Tables 1-6 for examples of 584 compounds made which include instant compounds. Especially see examples 1-206 and various compounds of Table 2-6 wherein X is NH.

Schaper does not exemplify all compounds generically embraced in compound of formula I. However, Sekiguchi exemplifies large number of compounds (examples 584) and thereby provides guidance and motivation to make the genus of compound of formula I. Hence, one trained in the art would be motivated to make the compounds of the genus of formula I and expect them to have the sue taught therein.

Claims 1-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Sekiguchi et al. EP 1, 464,335.

The applied reference has a common inventors with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an

invention “by another”; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2).

Sekiguchi teaches several pyrimidine derivatives of formula I as MCH antagonists which include instant compounds for the same use. See page 5, formula I and note the definition of Q, L, Y and R<sub>1</sub>. Note when R<sub>1</sub> is formula IV, compounds taught by Sekiguchi include instant compounds. See pages 5-133 for detailed description of the invention, various preferred embodiments, species made and pages 155-161 for the process of making these pyrimidines. Especially see species shown in pages 90-92, 99-103, 105-107,111, 117-132 for pyrimidine species. See also examples 1-3398 which include pyrimidines claimed in the instant claims.

Sekiguchi does not exemplify all compounds generically embraced in compound of formula I. However, Sekiguchi exemplifies large number of compounds (examples 1-3398) and thereby provides guidance and motivation to make the genus of compound of formula I. Hence, one trained in the art would be motivated to make the compounds of the genus of formula I and expect them to have the sue taught therein.

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is James O. Wilson, whose telephone number is 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAG. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

/Venkataraman Balasubramanian/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1624